

Maximal symmetry and metric-affine $f(R)$ gravity

Tuomas Multamäki, Jaakko Vainio, and Iiro Vilja

Department of Physics, University of Turku, FIN-20014, Finland

The affine connection in a space-time with a maximally symmetric spatial subspace is derived using the properties of maximally symmetric tensors. The number of degrees of freedom in metric-affine gravity is thereby considerably reduced while the theory allows spatio-temporal torsion and remains non-metric. The Ricci tensor and scalar are calculated in terms of the connection and the field equations derived for the Einstein-Hilbert as well as for $f(R)$ Lagrangians. By considering specific forms of $f(R)$, we demonstrate that the resulting Friedmann equations in Palatini formalism without torsion and metric-affine formalism with maximal symmetry are in general different in the presence of matter.

I. INTRODUCTION

Based on the cosmological principle derived from Copernican principle of mediocrity and large scale observations, standard cosmology assumes a homogeneous and isotropic universe. One finds that there are several studies backing this assumption (e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4]). Although the cosmological principle still holds its position as the bedrock of most cosmological models, recently the claim for homogeneity has nonetheless been seriously contested (e.g. [5, 6, 7]): intuitively one finds this credible as at least on small scales the universe is indeed very inhomogeneous.

The idea of homogeneity and isotropy of the universe has been around for a long time. Its cosmological implications have been studied thoroughly in the context of the metric formalism of the General Relativity (GR). Metric-affine formulation of gravity is also an early idea (for its history, see e.g. [8]) based on general concepts of pseudo-Riemannian theory of manifolds where no *a priori* relation between the metric and the connection is assumed. However, there have been few studies into the effects of homogeneity and isotropy on the independent connection in metric-affine gravity, probably because the Einstein-Hilbert action does not make a distinction between the two formalisms.

After the initial interest, metric-affine gravity received only marginal attention until it flared again in the 1970s [9, 10]. There were high hopes that metric-affine gravity might lead us closer to quantum gravity. Failure to do so lead metric-affine gravity aside once again. It functioned merely as curiosity until lately the interest in metric-

affine gravity has grown rapidly since Vollick [11] argued that it is possible to explain the accelerating expansion of the universe without the cosmological constant by modifying the Einstein-Hilbert action.

In metric-affine gravity the connection is independent of the metric and has 64 components which are functions of temporal and spatial coordinates. Intuitively, it is clear that by assuming symmetries of the universe, say homogeneity and isotropy, the degrees of freedom should decrease. This is indeed well-known to be true also for the affine connection and the consistent use of symmetry principles forms the basis of the present paper. Our aim is to study the general structure of metric-affine formalism, in the context of $f(R)$ theories of gravity exploiting the symmetries of homogeneous and isotropic universe. More formal studies of $f(R)$ gravity with torsion have also been conducted recently, see e.g. [12, 13] and references therein.

The difference between metric and metric-affine formalisms is manifested by two important fundamental features. Torsion is allowed in metric-affine gravity unlike in GR (for a review, see [14]). The connection can also deviate from GR in non-metricity. According to Sotiriou [15] both can be induced by matter. However, there is not much experimental evidence to rule out torsion (nor non-metricity) or to prove its existence [16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. This is in part caused by the different role it plays in different theories - e.g. in teleparallelism torsion acts as a force while in GR torsion vanishes by definition and curvature geometrizes gravity.

By using symmetry to reduce the degrees of freedom in metric the field equations become much more sim-

ple. Comparing the results in standard cosmology and results in metric-affine formalism it is possible to better see the role which the independent connection plays. The present study is organized as follows: In section II we devise the general tools needed for the following sections. In section III we consider a homogeneous and isotropic space and derive the independent components of the connection and calculate the Ricci tensor and scalar as a function of the found components. The results of section III are put into use in section IV. In the case of Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian we restrict ourselves to the case of empty space and see how the results relate to standard cosmology. Then we generalize to $f(R)$ actions and also add matter. In section V we discuss our results.

II. SYMMETRY IN SPACE-TIME

The symmetry of space can be formalized in terms of isometry and form invariance. A space is form invariant [21] under an isometric coordinate transformation $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$ if corresponding metric tensors are related by $\bar{g}_{\alpha\beta}(y) = g_{\alpha\beta}(y)$ for all y . In the case of infinitesimal transformations defined by Killing vectors $\bar{x}^\mu = x^\mu + X^\mu(x)$ this is easily seen to be equivalent with the requirement of vanishing Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_X g_{\mu\nu} = 0$ [22, 23]. The Lie derivative can be expressed in terms of Levi-Civita connection, i.e. Christoffel symbol $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \mu\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ as

$$\mathcal{L}_X g_{\mu\nu} = 2\partial_{(\mu} X_{\nu)} - 2X_\alpha \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \mu\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The affine connection can be most generally written as a sum of a Christoffel symbol a torsion part and a non-metricity part [9]. However, if the connection is metric, i.e. the non-metricity tensor ($Q_{\alpha\mu\nu} = -\nabla_\alpha g_{\mu\nu}$) vanishes, form invariance can be characterised by the Killing equation

$$\nabla_{(\nu} X_{\mu)} = 0. \quad (2)$$

Killing equation still allows for a non-zero torsion tensor [24] as connections of the form

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \alpha \\ \mu\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\} + \frac{1}{2} C_{\mu\nu}^\alpha, \quad (3)$$

where $C_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ is antisymmetric in the first two indices, fulfil (2) when (1) holds.

For a general tensor we require invariance in an infinitesimal isometric transformation as for all y

$$T'^{\mu\nu\dots}(y) = T^{\mu\nu\dots}(y). \quad (4)$$

leading to the conditions

$$0 = \frac{\partial X^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu} T_{\alpha\nu\dots}(x) + \frac{\partial X^\beta}{\partial x^\nu} T_{\mu\beta\dots}(x) + \dots + X^\lambda(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\lambda} T_{\mu\nu\dots}(x). \quad (5)$$

In a maximally symmetric space, the requirement that the number of independent Killing vectors is maximal, i.e. eqs. (5) are satisfied, strongly restricts invariant tensors [21].

A scalar in a maximally symmetric space must always be a constant. For higher rank tensors the invariance equation can be written as

$$\delta_\mu^\alpha T^\beta_{\nu\dots} + \delta_\nu^\alpha T_\mu^\beta \dots + \dots = \delta_\mu^\beta T^\alpha_{\nu\dots} + \delta_\nu^\beta T_\mu^\alpha \dots + \dots \quad (6)$$

For our purposes the invariance conditions for tensors of rank 1, 2 and 3 in a four dimensional space-time with a maximally symmetric three dimensional subspace are needed. The first two can be easily found in the literature e.g. [21]. For rank three tensor the result is seldom calculated explicitly. From here on we use latin indices for the maximally symmetric subspace while the greek indices refer to four dimensional space-time.

The cases of covariant tensors of rank one and two easily yield that

$$A_i = 0 \quad (7a)$$

$$B_{ij} = f g_{ij}, \quad (7b)$$

where the function f does not depend on the coordinates of the maximally symmetric subspace. Applying (6) to a rank three tensor and contracting indices we get three equations

$$(N-1)C_{njk} + C_{jnk} + C_{kjn} = 0 \quad (8a)$$

$$C_{jnk} + (N-1)C_{njk} + C_{nkj} = 0 \quad (8b)$$

$$C_{njk} + C_{knj} + (N-1)C_{jnk} = 0, \quad (8c)$$

where we have adopted a more general notation with N indicating the dimension of the maximally symmetric subspace. From these we obtain two useful conditions for form invariant tensors: they are invariant under cyclic index permutations,

$$C_{kjn} = C_{nkj}, \quad (9)$$

and they are antisymmetric in the first two indices, except for $N = 3$, since

$$(N - 3)C_{[nj]k} = 0. \quad (10)$$

From the set of conditions above it follows that all tensors of rank three vanish unless the maximally symmetric subspace is three dimensional i.e. $N = 3$. As the torsion and non-metricity tensors are rank three, they may hence exist only in three dimensional maximally symmetric (sub)spaces (see also [24]). With $N \neq 3$ the connection is then necessarily the Levi-Civita connection.

III. HOMOGENEOUS AND ISOTROPIC SPACE

A. Affine connection

A metric with a homogeneous and isotropic subspace can be written in spherical coordinates as [21]

$$g_{\mu\nu} = b^2(t)dt^2 - a^2(t)\tilde{g}_{ij}dx^i dx^j, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\tilde{g}_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 - kr^2}dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \quad (12)$$

is the metric of the spatial part. Usually a rescaling of the time coordinate is performed [25] to remove the function $b(t)$ but at this point we postpone doing this. This ensures that we can calculate the equations of motion by varying the action with respect to $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ instead of varying with respect to the full metric tensor.

Taking advantage of the symmetries of space-time, we require that covariant derivation of a maximally symmetric tensor preserves invariance, i.e. maximal symmetry. Thereupon we can reduce the number of degrees of freedom in the connection by utilizing results of the previous section. First we consider a maximally symmetric covariant vector V_ν . According to (7a) only $V_0 \neq 0$ and $V_0 = V_0(t)$. Hence

$$\nabla_0 V_0 = \partial_0 V_0 - \Gamma_{00}^0 V_0 = b(t) \Rightarrow \Gamma_{00}^0 \equiv c_0(t), \quad (13)$$

and we see that Γ_{00}^0 depends on time only. Moreover

$$0 = \nabla_0 V_i = \partial_0 V_i - \Gamma_{0i}^\alpha V_\alpha \Rightarrow \Gamma_{0i}^0 \equiv 0, \quad (14a)$$

$$0 = \nabla_i V_0 = \partial_i V_0 - \Gamma_{i0}^\alpha V_\alpha \Rightarrow \Gamma_{i0}^0 \equiv 0, \quad (14b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(t)\tilde{g}_{ij} &= \nabla_i V_j = \partial_i V_j - \Gamma_{ij}^\alpha V_\alpha \\ &\Rightarrow \Gamma_{ij}^0 = -\frac{f(t)}{V_0}\tilde{g}_{ij} \equiv c_n(t)\tilde{g}_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (14c)$$

Keeping in mind that maximally symmetric contravariant vectors only have one nonvanishing component, one finds that

$$\Gamma_{0j}^i = c_t(t)\delta_j^i. \quad (15)$$

Similar constraints can be derived for rank two tensors, for example

$$0 = \nabla_0 B_{0i} = \partial_0 B_{0i} - \Gamma_{00}^\beta B_{\beta i} - \Gamma_{i0}^\beta B_{0\beta} = -\Gamma_{00}^i B_{ii} \quad (16)$$

(no sum in the last form), implying that $\Gamma_{00}^i = 0$. Correspondingly the $0ij$ -component gives

$$\Gamma_{i0}^j = c_s(t)\delta_i^j. \quad (17)$$

The discussion above covers 37 components of the connection reducing them to four independent components c_0 , c_t , c_n and c_s . The last 27 components are found using the results of section II in three dimensions. Assuming that the non-metricity tensor vanishes in the maximally symmetric subspace the connection can be written as

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k = \left\{ \begin{matrix} k \\ ij \end{matrix} \right\} + K(t)\epsilon_{ij}{}^k, \quad (18)$$

where ϵ_{ijk} is the three dimensional Levi-Civita symbol. Note that here the second term, i.e. the torsion tensor, is invariant under cyclic permutations leaving only one degree of freedom.

Thus the connection preserving maximal symmetry in a three dimensional homogeneous and isotropic subspace can be reduced to four spatio-temporal components $c_i(t)$, one component, $K(t)$, characterizing spatial torsion and the usual metric Christoffel symbols of a maximally symmetric subspace. Their usual metric counterparts are

$$c_0 = 0 \quad (19a)$$

$$c_s = c_t = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \quad (19b)$$

$$c_n = a\dot{a} \quad (19c)$$

$$K = 0 \quad (19d)$$

with $b(t) = 1$.

B. Ricci tensor and scalar

The Ricci tensor and curvature scalar are now straightforwardly calculable. The Ricci tensor is given by [26]

$$R_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\alpha \Gamma_{\nu\mu}^\alpha - \partial_\nu \Gamma_{\alpha\mu}^\alpha + \Gamma_{\nu\mu}^\beta \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^\alpha - \Gamma_{\alpha\mu}^\beta \Gamma_{\nu\beta}^\alpha. \quad (20)$$

The components $0i$ and $i0$ vanish as they are maximally symmetric vectors of rank one in the subspace. The temporal 00 component reads as

$$R_{00} = 3(-\dot{c}_s + c_0 c_s - c_s c_t) \quad (21)$$

and the spatial components can be expressed as

$$R_{ij} = \tilde{R}_{ij} + (\dot{c}_n + c_n c_0 + 2c_n c_s - c_t c_n) \tilde{g}_{ij} + S_{ij}, \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{R}_{ij}$ is the standard Ricci tensor of the spatial part. Here the last term carries information on spatial torsion,

$$S_{ij} \equiv \partial_k (K \epsilon_{ji}{}^k) + K \epsilon_{ji}{}^k \left\{ \begin{matrix} l \\ lk \end{matrix} \right\} + 2K \epsilon_{l[j}{}^k \left\{ \begin{matrix} l \\ i]k \end{matrix} \right\} - K^2 \epsilon_{li}{}^k \epsilon_{jk}{}^l. \quad (23)$$

As S_{ij} is antisymmetric and g_{ij} symmetric, contraction of the Ricci tensor yields

$$R = -\frac{3}{a^2} (2k + \dot{c}_n + \dot{c}_s \frac{a^2}{b^2} + 2c_n c_s + C(c_n - c_s \frac{a^2}{b^2}) - 2K^2), \quad (24)$$

where we have used the fact that $\tilde{R} = -6k/a^2$ and denoted $C \equiv c_0 - c_t$. Note that one can also derive the curvature scalar by using only the torsion tensor instead of the connection, as was done in [24].

IV. FIELD EQUATIONS

A. Einstein-Hilbert action

Although our goal is to study the results of the previous section in a general $f(R)$ model, it is illuminating to consider the Einstein-Hilbert action in an empty space. Now the action reads as

$$S = - \int_U d\Omega \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2\kappa} R(a, b, c_0, c_t, c_n, \dot{c}_n, c_s, \dot{c}_s, K) \quad (25)$$

with R given in eq. (24) and $\kappa \equiv 8\pi G$. By variation we obtain the field equations:

$$0 = 2k + \dot{c}_n + 3\dot{c}_s \frac{a^2}{b^2} + 2c_n c_s + C(c_n - 3c_s \frac{a^2}{b^2}) - 2K^2 \quad (26a)$$

$$0 = 2k + \dot{c}_n - \dot{c}_s \frac{a^2}{b^2} + 2c_n c_s + C(c_n + c_s \frac{a^2}{b^2}) - 2K^2 \quad (26b)$$

$$0 = c_n - \frac{a^2}{b^2} c_s \quad (26c)$$

$$0 = 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a} - \frac{\dot{b}}{b} - 2\frac{b^2}{a^2} c_n + C \quad (26d)$$

$$0 = 2c_s + C - \frac{\dot{a}}{a} - \frac{\dot{b}}{b} \quad (26e)$$

$$0 = K. \quad (26f)$$

Eqs. (26a) and (26b) are exactly the Einstein's equations, albeit written in an unfamiliar form. Note that c_0 and c_t have exactly the same equation of motion as they appear in the action only through the combination $C(t) = c_0(t) - c_t(t)$. Therefore here, and in the presence of matter as long as it couples only to the metric, there is a spurious degree of freedom.

Combining the results (26c) - (26f) we find

$$K = 0, \quad (27a)$$

$$c_s = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}, \quad (27b)$$

$$c_n = \frac{\dot{a}a}{b^2}, \quad (27c)$$

$$C = -\frac{\dot{a}}{a} + \frac{\dot{b}}{b}. \quad (27d)$$

The first two are exactly the same as in the metric case. The third one coincides also to the metric case after time rescaling taking $b = 1$. The last equation, however, requires more analysis. If we assume that torsion vanishes, including spatio-temporal components $c_t = c_s$, or that the connection is spatio-temporally metric $\nabla_i g_{0j} = \nabla_j g_{i0} = 0$ (i.e. $c_t = \frac{b^2}{a^2} c_n = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} = c_s$) the result is again the same as in metric theory. Thus we are left with only one extra degree of freedom which is the spurious one having physical meaning only if the matter is coupled directly to the connection. The maximally symmetric case of Einstein-Hilbert action metric-affine formalism brings only one extra degree of freedom when the matter Lagrangian does not depend explicitly on the connection i.e. it has no hypermoment [9]. This agrees with the idea that hypermoment causes torsion [15].

B. General $f(R)$ Lagrangian

The analysis in a general $f(R)$ theory with matter follows along similar lines as above. We assume that the matter Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_m$ does not depend explicitly on the connection i.e. the hypermoment is zero. In this case the gravitational Lagrangian is given by $\mathcal{L} = ba^3 f(R(a, b, C, c_n, \dot{c}_n, c_s, \dot{c}_s, K))$ and the field equations are now

$$2\kappa \frac{T^i_i}{3} = f(R) + \frac{2}{a^2}(2k + 2c_n c_s + \dot{c}_n + Cc_n - 2K^2)f'(R) \quad (28a)$$

$$2\kappa T^0_0 = f(R) + \frac{6}{b^2}(\dot{c}_s - Cc_s)f'(R) \quad (28b)$$

$$0 = f'(R)\left(\frac{c_s}{b^2} - \frac{c_n}{a^2}\right) \quad (28c)$$

$$f''(R)\dot{R} = f'(R)\left(C + 2c_s - \frac{\dot{b}}{b} - \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right) \quad (28d)$$

$$f''(R)\dot{R} = -f'(R)\left(C - 2c_n \frac{b^2}{a^2} - \frac{\dot{b}}{b} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right) \quad (28e)$$

$$0 = f'(R)K. \quad (28f)$$

If $f'(R) \neq 0$, the third and last equations are readily solvable,

$$\begin{aligned} c_s &= \frac{b^2}{a^2}c_n, \\ K &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Summing eqs. (28d) and (28e) and using (29) we find

$$C = \frac{\dot{b}}{b} - \frac{\dot{a}}{a}. \quad (30)$$

Combining (28a), (28b), (29) and (30) gives

$$\frac{b^2}{a^2}c_n^2 + k + c_n\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} - \frac{\dot{b}}{b}\right) - \dot{c}_n = \frac{\kappa a^2(T^i_i - 3T^0_0)}{6f'(R)}. \quad (31)$$

Because the curvature scalar R can be expressed in terms of c_n , a and b , Eq. (31) is a nonlinear first order equation for c_n . It can be solved, at least in principle, for a given $f(R)$.

In the absence of matter summing the first two equations gives the trace equation,

$$f'(R)R - 2f(R) = 0, \quad (32)$$

implying that empty space is necessarily a space of constant curvature. Eqs (28d) and (28e) then yield

$$c_s = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}. \quad (33)$$

Thus we end up with same components for the connection as for the case of Einstein-Hilbert action without matter. We can hence conclude that in a homogeneous and isotropic space without matter, the metric-affine formalism results in the same equations as metric formalism. As an easy check shows, adding the cosmological constant leaves the situation unaltered. Therefore, the possible new effects of metric-affine formalism are due to matter.

With matter that is not coupled to the independent connection, we still get equations (30), (29) and (31). The trace equation, however, changes. If the matter energy-momentum tensor is of perfect fluid form we have

$$f'(R)R - 2f(R) = \kappa(3p - \rho). \quad (34)$$

Here we note that in the special case of radiation filled universe the right hand side vanishes and once again we reproduce the results of metric formalism. Moreover, if the hypermoment were present all the aforementioned equations would change. Even the simple (28f) would become non-trivial and giving $K \propto (a^3 f'(R))^{-1}$. As the nature of the gravitation-matter coupling is not completely clear even this approach has some potential interest.

Although a radiation dominated universe reproduces the metric cosmology, this is not a general property. For example, if we choose $f(R) = R + \lambda R^2$, with λ some small constant, and examine a non-relativistic matter filled universe, the trace equation (34) yields

$$R = \kappa\rho = \frac{\kappa\rho_0}{a^3}, \quad (35)$$

where ρ_0 is a constant and we have rescaled time so that $b = 1$. From equations (29), (30) and (28d) we then get

$$c_n = \frac{a\dot{a}(a^3 - \kappa\rho_0\lambda)}{2\kappa\rho_0\lambda + a^3}. \quad (36)$$

Clearly we need $\rho_0 = 0$ in order to reproduce $c_n = \dot{a}a$ (i.e. the metric solution), leaving empty space as the only possibility. If, however, we allow for non-Levi-Civita connections there are other possibilities. Inserting Eq. (36) into (28b) and (35) we can eliminate $\ddot{a}$ to obtain an effective Friedmann equation

$$H^2 = -\frac{(2\kappa\lambda + a^3)(\frac{1}{2}\kappa^2\lambda\rho_0^2 + 6\kappa\lambda k a - \kappa\rho_0 a^3 + 3k a^4)}{3a^3(a^3 - \kappa\lambda\rho_0)^2}. \quad (37)$$

If we expand this equation in λ , the result is the more intuitive

$$H^2 = \frac{\kappa\rho_0}{3a^3} - \frac{k}{a^2} + \left(\frac{7\kappa^2\rho_0^2}{6a^6} - \frac{6\kappa\rho_0 k}{a^5} \right) \lambda + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2). \quad (38)$$

The limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ coincides with standard cosmology as expected. Note, that the correction $\propto a^{-6}$ can be created also by adding non-metric matter coupling, i.e. hypermoment, as in [24], but here it is created solely by the form of the gravitational Lagrangian. Comparing Eq. (37) to the results in the Palatini formalism (without torsion) [11, 27, 28] we find that they agree.

This raises the question, whether our maximally symmetric approach generally coincides with the results in the more commonly considered Palatini formalism. In order to answer this question, we consider a toy model where the Lagrangian is of the form $f(R) = R^n$. Following the procedure above results in an effective Friedmann equation

$$H^2 = -\frac{4n^2 k}{(n-3)^2 a^2} - \frac{2n(n+1)}{3(n-3)^2} A^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (39)$$

where $A = \frac{\kappa\rho_0}{(n-2)a^3}$. The corresponding equation in the Palatini formalism reads as

$$H^2 = \frac{2n((1-n)A^{\frac{1}{n}}a^3 + 2\kappa\rho_0 A^{\frac{1-n}{n}} - 6nka)}{3a^3((7n+6)n-9)}. \quad (40)$$

Hence, we see that the coincidence in the λR^2 model was an exception: the maximally symmetric formalism and the Palatini formalism in general lead to different dynamical equations. The difference is pronounced in the case of $n = 3$, where the Palatini formalism is well-behaved but here we find that our approach is singular in the sense that no Friedmann equation can be derived. Note, that there is also singularity at $n = 2$ in both cases as the trace equation for $f(R) = R^2$ holds only in empty space. Our result should be compared with the result of [12] where it was found that metric-affine formalism with torsion only, i.e. with fully vanishing non-metricity does coincide with Palatini formalism.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have studied a homogeneous and isotropic space with a maximally symmetric formalism in $f(R)$ theories of gravity. The effects of homogeneity

and isotropy in the standard Einstein-Hilbert case has been discussed before [24] but here we have shown that even in more general $f(R)$ theories, only one spurious extra degree of freedom appears in empty space.

Interesting possibilities begin to emerge, when one includes matter in the system. In the case of the Einstein-Hilbert action, the addition of matter without hypermoment does not change the solutions of the field equations from those of metric formalism. New types of solutions appear only if the matter Lagrangian has an explicit dependence on the connection [24], in which case the connection is even less determined for general $f(R)$ Lagrangians. These results are in accordance with those of [15] where it was argued that torsion is caused by the antisymmetric part of the hypermoment.

However, even for ordinary matter (i.e. no hypermoment), the construction of the Friedmann equations reveal that the maximally symmetric formalism is dynamically different from the corresponding Palatini formalism although they may coincide in some special cases. This appears to be a consequence of inclusion of spatio-temporal non-metricity. Indeed the difference between the two formalisms is due to the fact that in the Palatini formalism torsion is assumed to vanish *a priori* whereas here only spatial non-metricity is assumed to vanish. Therefore the degrees of freedom in these two approaches are dissimilar resulting in a differently constrained system. Physically it is unclear which approach one should adopt. As there is almost no evidence for torsion, the usual pick would be Palatini formalism. Metric-affine formalism, however, is more general and is based on the explicit use of the cosmological principle.

In all cases a spurious degree of freedom which has little or no physical meaning remains. It emerges because two components of the connection appear only as a certain combination in the Lagrangian. As they affect the physics of the universe only via this combination, their geometrical interpretation can be found if there are non-metric matter couplings present.

The cosmological consequences of the maximally symmetric formalism is an interesting possible direction of studies as well as generalization to spherically symmetric systems. Both are likely to give at least some constraints for a given $f(R)$ theory. Furthermore, although isotropy is commonly accepted there have been numerous

articles investigating the possibility of an inhomogeneous universe [5, 6, 7, 29, 30], motivating further study of the the connection in an inhomogeneous and isotropic space.

These results could be used to ease the usage of metric-affine formalism in spherically symmetric universes.

-
- [1] S. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Spacetime* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973).
 - [2] S. J. Stoeger, William R., R. Maartens, and G. F. R. Ellis, *Astrophys. J.* **443**, 1 (1995).
 - [3] A. Hajian and T. Souradeep, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 123521 (2006), astro-ph/0607153.
 - [4] A. Kashlinsky, I. I. Tkachev, and J. Frieman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 1582 (1994), astro-ph/9405024.
 - [5] H. Alnes, M. Amarzguoui, and O. Gron, *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 083519 (2006), astro-ph/0512006.
 - [6] K. Enqvist, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40**, 451 (2008), arXiv:0709.2044 [astro-ph].
 - [7] J. Garcia-Bellido and T. Haugboelle (2008), arXiv:0802.1523 [astro-ph].
 - [8] M. Ferraris, M. Francaviglia, and C. Reina, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **14**, 243 (1982).
 - [9] F. W. Hehl, P. von der Heyde, and G. D. Kerlick, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **48**, 393 (1976).
 - [10] F. W. Hehl and G. D. Kerlick, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **9**, 691 (1977).
 - [11] D. N. Vollick, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 3813 (2004), gr-qc/0312041.
 - [12] S. Capozziello, R. Cianci, C. Stornaiolo, and S. Vignolo, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 6417 (2007), 0708.3038.
 - [13] S. Capozziello, R. Cianci, C. Stornaiolo, and S. Vignolo (2008), 0801.0445.
 - [14] I. L. Shapiro, *Phys. Rept.* **357**, 113 (2002), hep-th/0103093.
 - [15] T. P. Sotiriou and S. Liberati, *Annals Phys.* **322**, 935 (2007), gr-qc/0604006.
 - [16] R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira (2008), arXiv:0801.4148 [gr-qc].
 - [17] Y. Mao, M. Tegmark, A. Guth, and S. Cabi, *Phys. Rev.* **D76**, 104029 (2007), gr-qc/0608121.
 - [18] R. T. Hammond, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **65**, 599649 (2002).
 - [19] V. A. Kostelecky, N. Russell, and J. Tasson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 111102 (2008), 0712.4393.
 - [20] N. Russell (2008), 0803.2228.
 - [21] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of the General Theory of Relativity* (John Wiley et Sons, Inc., New York, 1972), ISBN 0-471-92567-5.
 - [22] G. Hall, *Symmetries and Curvature Structure in General Relativity*, vol. 46 of *World Scientific Notes in Physics* (World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Singapore, 2004).
 - [23] O. Grøn and S. Hervik, *Einstein's General Theory of Relativity* (Springer, New York, NY, USA, 2007), ISBN 978-0387691992.
 - [24] I. Bloomer, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **9**, 763 (1978).
 - [25] P. Dirac, *General Theory of Relativity* (John Wiley et Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1975).
 - [26] N. Straumann, *General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics* (Springer, New York, NY, USA, 1984).
 - [27] T. Koivisto, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 4289 (2006), gr-qc/0505128.
 - [28] K. Kainulainen, V. Reijonen, and D. Sunhede, *Phys. Rev.* **D76**, 043503 (2007), gr-qc/0611132.
 - [29] H. Alnes and M. Amarzguoui, *Phys. Rev.* **D75**, 023506 (2007), astro-ph/0610331.
 - [30] D. Garfinkle, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 4811 (2006), gr-qc/0605088.